



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

md

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,723	05/23/2001	Natasha P. Hixon	4842US	2791
24247	7590	12/15/2003	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			CHOI, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,723

Applicant(s)

HIXON ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen Choi

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 November 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 12, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balback (US 5,327,652).

Balback discloses all the recited elements of the invention including:

- a) a first member (19) including a die receiving surface (24), a die retaining element (30) associated with the die receiving surface, and a substantially planar die (26);
- b) a second member (18) including a substantially planar die sheet supporting surface (22);
- c) handles (12, 13).

Regarding claim 14, element 30 mechanically secures element 26 to element 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balback (US 5,327,652) in view of Benson et al. (US 5,660,105).

Balback discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the die retaining element being magnetic. Benson teaches a magnetic die retaining element (44). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a magnetic die retaining element as taught by Benson on the device of Balback in order to facilitate attaching and disconnecting of the die.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balback (US 5,327,652) in view of Sabin (US 5,172,622).

Balback discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a cushioning member. Sabin discloses a cushioning member (22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a cushioning member as taught by Sabin on the device of Balback in order to minimize wear on a cutting edge of the die.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Advisory action mailed on 24 October 2003.

Regarding claims 12, 14, and 16, applicants contend that Balback does not expressly or inherently describe any substantially planar sheet supporting surface and a die retaining element configured to receive a substantially planar die. Applicants further contend that element 26 of Balback cannot be considered to be substantially planar.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figures 1-3 clearly show element 22 having a substantially planar supporting surface. Furthermore, the substantially planar die of the present invention includes a protruded cutting edge (68) as is in Balback. Balback shows a die retaining element (30) configured to receive a substantially planar die (26).

Regarding claim 13, applicants contend that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had no reason combine the teachings and to expect the asserted combination to be successful.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is old and well known to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a magnetic element to facilitate connecting or disconnecting two elements as evidenced by Benson. The examiner's rejection relied on the teaching of Benson using a magnetic element to retain a die member.

Regarding claim 15, applicants contend that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine teachings since Balback and Sabin disclose different apparatus and no reason to expect to incorporate the pad 22 of Sabin into the apparatus of Balback.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Balback and Sabin are both related to a die cutter and the use of a cushioning pad is old and well known in the art as evidenced by Sabin for the purpose of protecting a cutting edge. The examiner's rejection relied on the teaching of Sabin on the use of a cushioning pad and it is the examiner's position that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a cushioning pad on the device of Balback in order to protect a cutting edge.

Conclusion


8. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Choi whose telephone number is 703-306-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 9am and 5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

SC
December 11, 2003


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER